DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 350 RC 015 231

AUTHOR Gil, Carlos B.
TITLE The Many Faces of the Mexican-American; An Essay Concerning Chicano Character. Working Paper Series No. 1.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Chicano Studies.
PUB DATE 29 Aug 82
NOTE 69p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; Cultural Background; *Cultural Influences; *Culture Contact; Ethnicity; Geographic Location; Hispanic American Culture; Immigrants; Labeling (of Persons); Mexican American History; *Mexican Americans; Mexicans; Place of Residence; *Socioeconomic Influences; Values
IDENTIFIERS Cultural Values

ABSTRACT

Contemporary Mexican Americans have a multi-faceted character. Twentieth century Mexican Americans are no longer Mexicans but neither are they Anglo American. The strength of their Mexican traditions and cultural values and the forces of dilution to which these are exposed depend on various combined factors. Contributing to their multi-faceted character are their Mexican inheritance and the continuing cultural replenishment resulting from new immigrants and their importation of ideas, attitudes, ways of doing things, artifacts, and systems. The Mexican inheritance involves several components. Among these are racial features and the word labels which have survived for them; reliance upon the Spanish language in a monolingual, bilingual, or mixed fashion; the domestic environment (material and non-material); and the relations outside the home. Chicanos exhibit a greater socioeconomic diversity than did their ancestors because many have entered the lower end of the middle class and, in doing so, they have undergone varying stages of acculturation into Anglo America. The manner in which this has occurred differs widely. The degree of American-ness present in Mexican Americans is related to one's generation, geographical location of residence, socioeconomic position in American society, and degree of individuality. (NQA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carlos B. Gil

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CENTRO DE ESTUDIOS CHICANOS

WORKING PAPER SERIES

THE MANY FACES OF THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN;*

AN ESSAY CONCERNING CHICANO CHARACTER

By

Carlos B. Gil

Department of History

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington

© 1982

[*I am grateful to: Barbara Deane who spurred my thoughts in the direction reflected by this article; Professor Otis A. Pease who supplied me with valuable bibliographic references from his course on American Character; Professor Lauro Flores (Director of the University of Washington Centro de Estudios Chicanos) who consented to issue this essay as a working paper; to Angélica Hernández for typing the final draft; and to the University of Washington Institute for Ethnic Studies in the United States for defraying the printing costs involved in this publication.]

FOREWORD

The publication of this essay inaugurates a new project undertaken by the Center for Chicano Studies. The advantages that a Working Paper format offers are obvious. It should be emphasized, however, that in publishing occassional writings in a Working Paper Series, our main hope is to provide an adequate vehicle for a fruitful exchange of ideas among those occupied in a particular academic discipline or in an interdisciplinary activity concerning the life, culture and scholarly endeavors of Chicanos.

Needless to say, feedback to the author is not only desireable but instrumental in the making of the finished product. Thus, we invite and encourage readers to submit comments, criticisms and suggestions either directly to the author or through this Center. We also invite the submission of manuscripts for possible publication.

I must thank Carlos Gil for triggering the idea that gave birth to this project. Recognition must also go to the Institute for Ethnic Studies in the United States for providing the funds that made possible the printing of this first issue of our Working Paper Series.

August 29, 1982

Lauro Flores
Director, Center for Chicano Studies
Assistant Professor, Department of
Romance Languages and Literature

Despite many recent books, articles, theses, and dissertations describing the experience of the Chicano people, Casavantes' statement made in 1969 still holds true in the early 1980s: "there is not a great deal of agreement as to what exactly it is that constitutes being Mexican-American (1969,2)." Much of the writing by Chicano specialists far too lightly presumes a universal agreement of what constitutes our mexicanidad especial (our unique Mexican-ness). Or is it our americanidad peculiar? In any case, the works consulted for this essay do not adequately respond to Casavantes' implied question: what constitutes being Mexican-American?

This essay should help students of the Chicano people in several ways. First, it should serve as a conceptualizing tool for further discussion and analysis. Second, it gathers dispersed published information containing significant references to the subject of Chicano characterology and refashions it into a more complete and complementary whole. More than a mere re-assembly of facts, this essay helps out in yet a third way. It recognizes the uniqueness of the Chicano people stemming from the fact that they bridge two very dissimilar cultures. Chicanos may be viewed as cultural pioneers because their experience blends the traditional with the modern. It falls to the scholar to begin to specify the nature of this blend. In this context the Mexican-American or Chicano people need to be seen as a complex and confounding blend of northern Mexico and the western United States.

In more ways than may be stated in the pages that follow, they stand as the many-colored poly-variant product of the clash between the two most formidable imperial forces in the western world, the Spanish and the Anglo-American.

Several caveats need to be observed. One is that the study of any national or ethnic character (originally the domain of anthropologists) has been plagued by limitations of a diverse sort (Hoebel 1967,2). Thus, the reader is forwarned that this essay focuses upon an elusive, subjective, and controversial topic. There probably cannot be a last word on the subject. Even so, the literature on the Chicano people, historical and otherwise, has now achieved sufficient maturity and sophistication to begin an even-handed identification and examination of the elements that make Chicanos a unique group within Western American society.*

---

*Some writers (Murillo 1970, Casavantes 1976, Mirandé and Enríquez 1979, etc.), who have themselves pondered over the meaning of Mexican-American "culture," have noted a bewildering complexity in the Chicano people. This is a refreshing turn-around since Mexican-Americans had been viewed all too simplistically by many Anglo social scientists during the course of the 20th century (Clark 1908, Young 1930, Schwartz 1969, Gordon 1969, etc.; see Hernández 1970 for a stinging critique of Schwartz & Gordon). Even so, the writers identified at the beginning of this footnote agree that despite the complexity among Chicanos recognizable patterns emerge and they are worth studying.

Other writers take a more critical stance concerning the study of characterology. They may be represented by Padilla (1973) and Maciel (1973) who have reviewed the now classic cycle of Mexican literature which seeks to identify and assess Mexican character, or lo mexicano (Ramos, Paz, Uranga, Zea, etc.), and they seem to conclude that such works "fail" in their own goals because each Mexican author over-generalizes, over-speculates, and so forth. They "fail" because they do not sufficiently employ "empirical" data, the two authors conclude. In any event, the critical view of Padilla, in particular, cannot be taken into account here because the remedies he offers are grounded on the individualistic or microscopic orientation which is characteristic of his discipline, psychology. For our purposes, collective human expression, especially that which concerns itself with cultural or political self-identity, is far too complex and fluid to be measured through limited clinical systems. In any case, the controversial question of how best to study national or ethnic character will not be laid to rest here.

Furthermore, in order to attain some degree of accomplishment in this task, it is necessary to lay-out the widest possible conceptual framework, one which tries to go beyond contemporary or perishable attitudes. For this reason, this essay does not confine itself to the term "Chicano" because far too many writers attribute a contemporary political dimension to it (Peñalosa 1970, Hernández 1970, Gómez Quiñones and Arroyo 1976,179, etc.). The continuing tendency to do this may ultimately become self-defeating because all political movements or group attitudes of a political nature eventually disappear. Cultural patterns outlast political concepts, of course. Because the implications of this fact are many, it is fair to observe that the term "Chicano" meant little or nothing in the 1920s and only if we explain it as clearly as possible in the 1980s might it mean something tangible to our students and even to our own children and grandchildren in the year 2000.* There is yet another reason for writing this essay.

This article seeks to outline the sweep of what may be termed chicanidad (Chicano-ness) not only because a unifying vision is needed but also because Chicanos called for it more than ten years ago in the Chicano plan for higher education known as the Plan de Santa Bárbara (1970). Drawn up at the crest of political activism by Chicano students, faculty, administrators, and community delegates, the Plan proudly proclaimed that "The destiny of our people will be fulfilled....[by satisfying] the demand

---

* Manuel Gamino does not employ the term "Chicano" in his study of the Mexican people living in the United States in the years 1926-1927 because apparently it did not exist then. The word "chicamo" is mentioned once, however, on p. 233. See his Mexican Immigration to the United States, A Study of Human Adjustment (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930). One of the first Anglos to write about Mexican-Americans, John H. Burma, lists Gamio's book as the first on the subject. See Burma's "Another American Dilemma: Finding the 'Unknown Minority,'" Social Science Quarterly 52:1 (1971) 30-34.

for a relevant educational experience (43)." This would be accomplished by the creation of Chicano studies curriculae in colleges and universities across the country which would

> organize the Chicano experience, past and present, in accordance with established categories. The unity of Chicano being is based, in large part, on the Chicano heritage or la herencia del ser chicano ....Chicano studies should produce, among other things, understanding of one's self, of one's people, and of one's cultural ways. (43).

I believe that "la herencia del ser chicano" (the origins of Chicano-ness) remains misunderstood.

Albeit, in 1967, even before the Plan de Santa Bárbara was conceived, Guzmán offered a more concrete rationale sounding similar to the proposal contained in the Plan:

> If we are to help our youngsters to be proud of their Hispanic Mexican heritage, we are wisest in giving them specific elements about which they can be legitimately proud. To be Mexican does not mean to be poor and ignorant. To speak Spanish well, to enjoy Mexican music and Mexican food, to periodically recall the customs and way of life of Spain and of Mexico, those are truly Chicano (Casavantes, 1967,7).

According to Guzmán, an important part of being Chicano is to appreciate one's Mexican cultural heritage. But, some problems arise from this.

Is it enough to speak Spanish well and to recall the way of life practiced by our forefathers in Mexico and in Spain? Let us keep in mind that Latin American Studies programs have graduated Anglos who are often bilingual in Spanish and English and know more about Spain and Mexico than many Chicanos. They, of course, would not qualify as Chicanos. In any

case, Guzmán's notions about what constitutes Chicano-ness are probably unsupported by a majority of Chicanos in the 1980s. If this is so, what, then, constitutes chicanidad? Is it merely the adoption of a certain type of political "radicalism" by the descendants of Mexican immigrants? If so, will it change by the year 2000?

The Complexity of Mexican-American-ness

Contemporary Mexican-Americans are of many faces and facets. One of these is observed in the differences between Chicanos born and raised in South Texas and those in the Los Angeles or San Francisco metropolitan areas. The contrast between one and the other go beyond the geographic and they are discussed in greater detail later in this essay. In the meantime, however, it may be pointed out that Moore (1971) statistically unveils the polar-relationship between Texas and California Chicanos. According to her data the son of the Golden State will have observed less overt racial discrimination, received a higher median wage, attended more years of formal schooling, and enjoyed better health conditions and housing than his Lone Star State cousin. Inversely and impressionistically, however, it can also be stated that the Chicano from South Texas enjoys stronger Mexican "roots" and he most probably relies on Spanish on a daily basis than does his California born cousin who may use it not at all. This continuum may be graphically expressed as follows:

Strong Mexican Traditionalism — Strong Anglo Orientation

South Texas — Los Angeles-San Francisco

Another element contributing to the multi-faceted character of Mexican-Americans is observable in "The Refill Effect;" it applies more

to Mexican-Americans than to any other American ethnic group. This term refers to the continuing cultural replenishment resulting from freshly arriving immigrants and their importation of 1) ideas, attitudes, and ways of doing things, and 2) of "Mexicana." The ideas are examined in a later section. In the meanwhile let us turn to "Mexicana."

"Mexicana" is part of the "Refill Effect." I find it a useful term because it refers to the many artifacts and systems which Mexican immigrants bring with them in order to more sanely adjust to life in the United States. More specifically, I employ this term to refer to the sum total of materials which symbolize a Mexican way of life. Examples may include not only such simple artifacts as mortars and pestles (molcajetes), clay cooking ware, guitars, wooden hand-mixers for making chocolate beverages, etc., but also actual commercial establishments representing total cultural transfers from cities in Mexico's interior. These establishments may take the form of tortilla factories, taquerias (taco stands or restaurants--"al estilo Uruapan," "al estilo tapatío, etc.), shoe stores specializing in Mexican-made footwear ("Zapatos Canadá"), record and book shops, movie houses, butcher shops, etc. How all of this impacts on the formation of a distinct Mexican-American-ness has not been examined systematically.

If a "Refill Effect" exists, culturally speaking, so do the filtered cultural products or "filtrates." The concept of filtration, here, refers to the conscious or unconscious selection of "Mexicana" and Mexican cultural ways by Mexican-Americans.

The "filtrates" may be illustrated as follows. A very observant New Yorker visiting Southern California, for the first time, would learn that Mexican-Americans manifest varying degrees of Mexican-ness. Beyond observing that most would be easily detected by their brown skin and dark hair

and eyes, others however would not be so easily identified due to their fair skin and blondish hair. When not nourishing themselves with standard American fare, most would be seen eating tortillas prepared in one form or another, often as "burritos" (unknown in Mexico). Fewer, yet, could be seen consuming taquitos de puerco en pipián (a special type of tacos) and still less might be observed requesting chongos zamoranos for their dessert. In other words, our New York observer would detect a pattern of selectivity with regard to Mexican ways.

To go on with the illustration, many Chicanos would be observed dressing in business suits, others in the casual style typical of California, some in cowboy clothes, an exotic few in a fashionable version of peasant garb highlighted by huaraches and bleached cottons, and most teenagers would be seen in their freakish cholo costumes and accented make-up. Music would vary from canciones rancheras, enjoyed almost exclusively by the recently arrived immigrants, while the more Americanized Mexican-Americans would be observed gyrating to the raucous "punk-rock" of the early 1980s. Speech-wise, our East Coast visitor could over-hear plain west coast English or varying accents blending English and Spanish in odd and exotic ways. On a less observable plane, some Mexican-Americans would depend on a compadre or a padrino to obtain a greatly desired job but most, like their Anglo neighbors, would probably rely on existing, impersonal bureacratic systems to get ahead in their jobs and careers.

The "filtrates" seen in the examples above represent the Mexican artifact (i.e., tortilla, guitars, huaraches, etc.) and/or the way of doing something (i.e., singing corridos in Spanish, relying on compadres, etc.) preserved from the immigrant generation. These may be often combined with

Anglo artifacts or ways of doing things as discussed below.

The variety suggested above is found anywhere Mexican-Americans reside. How these patterns have developed among the Chicanos living away from the cultural matrix of the Southwest remains to be studied. In any case, the cultural variety defies an easy assessment.

Nonetheless, it is possible to establish criteria which may help us begin to define the way in which the nature of Mexican-American-ness flows. We need to appreciate its breadth and depth. In order to do this, the remainder of this essay identifies and discusses two major cultural fonts (i.e., the Mexican and the Anglo) and the qualifying factors which contribute to the varying character of Mexican-American-ness (i.e., Time, Place, the Objective Condition, and Individuality).

The Mexican Inheritance

As a principle ingredient of lo chicano, the Mexican Inheritance is most often mentioned in one form or another by the Chicano specialists whose works were consulted for this essay. It also constitutes the one general cultural element which has most distinguished the Hispanics living in the Southwest since the early 1600s yet it has not remained static. The essence of Mexican-ness existing among the Californios in the early 1800s is not the same as that brought to the United States by the author's own parents between 1917 and 1922 nor is it entirely the duplicate of that carried in by legal or illegal immigrants in the 1980s. In other words, the Mexican Inheritance exists in a complex and changing manner and it may also be entirely ignored by one Chicano and deeply cherished by another. Unfortunately, the latter is less often the case.

Beyond the "Mexicana" discussed earlier, the Inheritance factor is

itself made up of various components which themselves enjoy an intriguing variability of subcomponents, if only we could take them all apart like a ripe pomegranate. The ingredients making up this inheritance are many. The ones discussed below may be classified as follows:

* Racial features and surviving word labels
* Language
* The domestic environment, material and non-material
* Relations outside the home

The visible features of Mexican-American-ness which may be quickly observable with the eye are fundamentally racial ones. They include skin pigmentation, hair type, and eye-shape. Because Mexico became an amazing crucible of racial amalgamation during the colonial period (Mörner 1967, Leonard 1966), by inheritance, Chicanos also exhibit a wide array of the physical traits mentioned above. I touch upon this distinctly racial topic because Mexican history examines the rise and fall of generally white-skinned, race-conscious, peninsular Spaniards and their gradual replacement by another white-skinned group known as the criollos seconded by light -skinned mestizos. Both commanded the darker hued mestizos and other castas including the Indians who have remained subordinate since the conquest. The ostracism which the "mixed breeds" received in Mexico for so long many have contributed to Mexican independence beginning with the bloody wars of 1810. To be sure, most pro-Independence fighters were criollos, mestizos, and mulattoes. A case in point is the vicious sacking of Guanajuato in 1811 accomplished by mobs of socially marginal individuals who rallied around the image of a madonna as dark as themselves--"La Virgen de Guadalupe." Upper-crust Mexicans and soldiers in the Spanish armies found strength to maintain their power in "La Virgen de los Remedios"

who appeared white-skinned (Sierra 1969, 152; LaFaye 1976). Later, too, an Indianist rennaissance was said to be felt throughout Mexico as a result of the Revolution of 1910. In its symbology the early phase of the Chicano Movement also emphasized Indian origins, especially Aztec. Both Mexicans and Chicanos, then, have been very conscious of their racial and ethnic make-up including skin-color.

Another reason why physical traits are discussed, here, is because word labels survive for them in everyday Spanish, spoken wholly or in fragments by Chicanos. The following terms exemplify them: "gringo," "güero" (a light-skinned male), "moreno claro" (light-olive skinned), "moreno," "moreno oscuro" or "prieto" (dark skinned), "negro," and "chino" (someone with Asian shaped eyes or close-cropped, tight, curly hair). I believe that these terms represent non-pejorative, linguistic remains of racial labels employed during the colonial era. Scholars have already shown that "pure-blooded" Mexican aristocrats often used these terms ("coyote," "no te entiendo," "salta-atrás," etc.) in order to designate the various racial amalgams produced by Spanish imperial conquest.

This practice gave rise to strategems which included "whitening" documents like the cédula de gracias al sacar which purportedly proved, for a lucky few, the existence of redeeming amounts of Spanish or "pure" blood. Many examples of this trend abound including the mulatto who did just this in order to gain university admittance (Instituto 1961, 37). Curiously many Mexican families living both in Mexico and in the United States still cling to the colonial value which prefers light skin to dark. As a last word on this subject, it may be added that New Mexican hispanos generally exhibit greater degrees of criollo ethnicity by virtue of their early frontier history while Chicanos born in Texas tend to display

a greater proportion of mestizo-ness as do Chicanos born in California. This is probably due to the fact that the largest numbers of 20th century immigrants from Mexico entered mostly into the two last named states.

The linguistic component of the Mexican Inheritance enjoyed by the Chicano is multifaceted and easily confounding. The purpose here is to identify it as an important feature of this Inheritance and to briefly address some of its peculaiarities associated with the topic of our concern.

The simplest view of it involves the reliance upon the Spanish language in a monolingual or bilingual fashion by most though not all Mexican-Americans. In any case, 7.8 million Spanish speakers were reported as residing in the United States in 1970. How many of these were actually Mexican-Americans is difficult to calculate although at least 2 million "Spanish-background" persons under the age of 21 were reported to enjoy limited English proficiency in 1978 (Bureau 1973, 599; National 1978). In any case, the use of and reliance upon Spanish depends on multiple factors including the generation to which a Chicano belongs in his family, his region of birth, amount of formal schooling, etc., as will be discussed in a later section.

Our knowledge about the Spanish language as spoken among the Hispanics of the United States is not limited to numbers of speakers. For example, Espinosa (1911, 1917), Campa (1979), and Blanco (1971) are noted for their work in isolating remnants of late medieval and Rennaissance Spanish in New Mexico and California and for tracing the evolution of the language in the United States since the 16th century, including its fusion with English resulting in varying forms such as pocho. Blanco says that "the pocho language is Spanish that has been corrupted by the influence of English or distorted English which has been adjusted to Spanish phonetics (29)."

Another exotic fusion distinct from pocho is the argot, caló pachuco, which Blanco believes may be rooted in the gypsy underworld. It merits noting here that both pocho and pachuco, as linguistic forms, may have been familiar to most Mexican-Americans at one time but only a minority of them actually practiced either of them regularly, all in accordance to selected socio-economic factors. Most Spanish-speaking Mexican-Americans in the 20th century have relied on what may be referred to as Mexican Spanish.

A complicated and apparently still unravelled feature of the linguistic peculiarities of the Mexican-American concerns the relationship between language and "cognitive style." In this respect, scholars believe that the manner in which a person grasps and expresses his understanding of abstractions, as opposed to the concrete world, is allegedly effected by the language(s) he speaks. In simpler terms, the way in which we speak reflects the way in which we think and conceptualize the reality around us. Whorf, foremost authority on this fascinating but murky subject, writes: "the structure of the language which one habitually uses influences the manner in which one understands his environment. The picture of the universe shifts from tongue to tongue (Carroll 1956; Casavantes 1976, 25-27)." Slightly more public than linguistic peculiarities, yet as sensitively personal, is the naming of individuals.

As an index of assimilative tendencies in a person or family, long ago many Mexican-Americans began to abandon their rich heritage of first names derived from Ibero-Roman roots seen in names such as Claudio, Juventino, Leovigilda, etc. These were transferred to Mexico during the colonial period, of course, and they stand as the most pervasive and durable Spanish imprint on Mexican society. Among Mexican-Americans, and even some modern-

oriented Mexicans, the change has gone in favor of modern Anglo names like Suzie, Judy, Charlie, Johnney-Ray, etc., and in Mexican-Americans even the patronymics are likewise losing ground through intermarriage with Anglos. The counter-movement made by some Chicanos in favor of Aztec names in the late 19 0s (i.e., Moctezuma, Xóchitl, Cuahtemoc, etc.; see Gil 1979, 9-10) is as admirable as it might have been ephemeral.

Even so, a relatively undetected and seemingly permanent alteration in name patterning is seen in the silent abandonment by Mexican immigrants of the Spanish form which places the patronymic and the matronymic after the first names. Thus, in Mexico the name Gregorio Martín Pérez Hernández announces to the world that Gregorio Martín's father's surname is Pérez and his mother's is Hernández. The Anglo-American tendency towards homogenized informality would eventually transform this name to Greg Perez and in a slightly more formal manner, usually for legal purposes, Gregory H. Perez, omitting accent marks and inverting the surname pattern and only initialling the matronymic. Most Mexican-Americans employ the Anglo form.

In searching for durable and somewhat more private aspects of mexicano ways, several considerations come to mind which may be clustered under the rubric of The Domestic Environment. These may be material or non-material. Their discussion follows.

One of the most obvious material items has to do with food, a brief analysis of which reveals a blending of Indian and Spanish origins. Pre-Hispanic influence on food, observed in many, though not all, Mexican-American homes is the clearest example we have of the Chicano's millenial heritage. This is easily noted the reliance on "the Holy Trinity" of corn, beans, and squash often laced with one or several of the many varieties of chili peppers which have been consumed in Meso America for many hundreds of years. The heavy consumption of meat is notably absent from the Mexican Indian diet and it appears under-emphasized in Mexican-American

cooking practices as well. This vegetarian orientation goes contrary to Harner who has put forward his theory concerning Aztec cannibalism (Ortiz de Montellano 1978).

Because pre-Christian méxica or Aztecs relied on corn as a staple, many corn-related Azted words survive in Chicano Spanish. These words include tortilla, elote, atole, pozole, tamal, nixtamal, nixayote, etc. Aztec words for kitchen utensils still used in some Chicano households likewise survive as in metate, metlapil, and molcajete, utensils whose designs have not changed for several centuries.

The Spanish influence in the food Chicanos eat is noticeable in a variety of ways the most obvious of which includes the reliance on European staples. Mexicans transformed wheat into bread too ("birotes," "semitas," "bolillos"), particularly sweet breads ("tostados," "conchas," "cuernos," etc.) and the wonderful giant-sized northern tortillas also known as "tortillas sonorenses." Mexicans also adopted rice, European styled milk products ("jocoqui," "queso manchego,"), and candied products known generally as "dulces de encernada," ("camote," "biznaga," "calabaza," "chilacayote," "de leche," etc.).

Beverage consumption offers a similar pattern. Pre-Hispanic Indian influences may be said to exist in beverages extracted from corn, such as atole and champurrado, or those derived from the maguey, such as pulque, mezcal, and tequila. The Spanish influence in this area may be noticed in the production of wine, milk, or varieties of aguardiente derived from sugarcane. Beer is later introduced into Mexico by Northern Europeans particularly Germans.

Variations and combinations of the above were carried by Hispanics from Mexico to the American Southwest. A study that would show how these

foods and beverages changed through time in order to become "Chicano" would certainly be welcomed by scholars and non-scholars alike.

The reliance upon "folk-healers" (also known as "curanderos" and "hechiceros") and herbs when afflicted with aches and pains or simply as a means for the maintenance of good health has been noted by anthropologists (Rubel 1966) and Chicano specialists (Romano-V 1965) alike. In addition to merely identifying these practices as constitutents of Mexican-American-ness, it needs to be noted as well that their use is regulated by the qualifying factors discussed in a later section. However, it may be stated here that each succeeding generation of Mexican immigrants, and their progeny born in America, relies less on these old fashioned practices. In any case, herb lore is not exclusively Indian. Spaniards, Englishmen, and other Europeans also relied heavily on herbs and other "natural" means of curing the infirm and afflicted (Freeman 1943). The medical knowledge of the Spanish fused with that of the native American during the colonial period, the former adopting newer methods based on science in the late 19th century and the latter conserving the ways of the ancient. Identifying the differences between Indian and pre-modern European practices is very difficult to do.

A historical discussion of other segments of a Chicano's material culture would have to include apparell, art, sculpture, and architecture both public and private. Scholarly studies are barely beginning in these areas. Fortunately, Quirarte has already examined selected Mexican-American artists and their art within a Mexican-American context. He views 17th century makers of santos, retablos, bultos, and other religious artifacts along with the presence in the Southwest of classical Mexican muralists, in the early 20th century, as seminal for later Chicano artists

(Quirarte 1973,31-32). Architecturally, Quirarte limits his discussion to public religious buildings (ie., the missions of the Southwest); he entirely ignores the private architecture found in homes which probably derived from central Mexico. To some extent, Ybarra-Frausto (1981) pursues the folkart which Quirarte does not.

In seeking a full understanding of Mexican-American material culture it is necessary to go beyond its public expression to the private. In this regard the work of George McClelland Foster (1960) may serve as a useful precedent for Chicano specialists interested in the formation of Chicano culture. Foster was interested to know how Indians and mestizos accepted, adapted to, or refused Spanish ways in the 16th and 17th century Mexico and how a Mexican fusion resulted from Indian and Spanish contributions. In tracing the Spanish origins of Latin American urban design, the use of domestic animals and fishing paraphernalia, of craftsmanship, market and transportation systems, etc., he uncovered a fluid adaption.

> This means that [Spanish] conquest culture was not formed overnight, to remain essentially static over a long period of time. Rather, it was fluid [at first], changing over the years as the composition of its carriers [also] changed (232).

In other words, a "crystallized" Mexican culture was formed by the 17th century once "the basic outlines of the new [Spanish-Indian] colonial culture took shape" and answers to the pressing questions of everyday existence were systematized by the end of the 16th century. It was at this time that the "Crystallization" of Mexican cultural forms began resisting further Spanish influence (233). What are the basic outlines of the new Chicano culture? Has "Crystallization" occurred? When? How? These questions need answers.

Let us proceed to the non-material aspects of a Chicano's Domestic Environment inherited from his Mexican past. Often discussed by Chicano specialists, here we come upon the Mexican-American family or Chicano "familism." Murillo (1971) identifies it as a principle foundation of Mexican-American life taking precedence over "the identification of

the Chicano self (his emphasis, 102)." Anticipating others, like Ramírez (1967) and Mirandé and Enríquez (1979,107), Murillo explains the strength of family ties among Chicanos:

> The chicano may view himself much of the time as an agent or representative of his family. In many respects this means that he must be careful of his behavior lest his actions somehow reflect adversely on his family.

The same may be stated in a more down to earth way. In reference to his fellow-Italians who share a Latin-derived culture with the Chicanos, Barzini (1964) comments about "the power" of the family:

> The family is a stronghold in a hostile land: within its walls and among its members, the individual finds consolation, help, advise, provisions, loans, weapons, allies and accomplices to aid him in his pursuits. No [one] who has a family is ever alone. He finds in it a refuge in which to lick his wounds after a defeat, or an arsenal and a staff for his victorious drives (190).

A detailed account of the strong family orientation of Mexican-Americans may be found in the work of Díaz-Guerrero and among anthropologists who have studied Mexican community life in the United States like Rubel and the much criticized Madsden (1964). As a component of Mexican-American life, familism also includes a strong father figure who is the object of much filial respect. This inward feature of mexicano life stems from both our Hispanic and Indian past which is discussed for Mexican-Americans in a fuller manner for the first time by Mirandé and Enríquez (1979). This type of analysis often appears as well in studies examining Latin American culture and life such as Emilio Willem's Latin American culture: An Anthropological Snythesis (1965) often overlooked by Chicano specialists. The cultural commonality between the Chicano people and the people of Latin America is difficult to overstate.

A subcomponent of Mexican-American familism is fictive kinship or the compadre or compadrazgo system. Along with the phenomenae of

familism and curanderismo, it has been celebrated often as a Chicano trait. And, indeed it should be. However, the compadrazgo system is actually a Latin trait found in many Catholic countries around the world. It probably survives most vigorously in Latin America and in Mexico moreso than in the American Southwest. The origins of this fundamentally spiritual system are traced to the Roman Catholic Church which fashioned it as a device to maintain the loyalty of converts and other proselytes, especially in the early and middle Middle Ages. One scholar finds remnants of this spiritual system even "among the English, the French, and other pre-Reformation Catholics in the 14th and 15th centuries (Bossy as quoted in Gil 1979, 11)." Keefe, Carlos, and Padilla (1979), however, write that while the compadre system remains operative among some Mexican-Americans, many are reported to rely on its social advantages less than is ordinarily claimed. The more traditional areas of the national Chicano community, however, may cling in a more tenacious manner to these and other practices surviving from the 18th and 19th centuries.

The non-material Mexican Inheritance must include other behavioral patterns which cover intra-family relations and relations between unrelated individuals in a wider community including those between men and women. A simplified view of these is contained in the terms machismo and hembrismo. Mirandé and Enríquez define these terms in a manner which happily avoids the negatively distorted images which are widespread. Instead of echoing the sterotypical male qualities contained in the words "powerful," "dominant," and "sexist," they define machismo as a combination of respectful "privileges" accorded a man who has earned "authority" or "self-worth" in and outside of his home (112). Hembrismo is likewise defined in a sensible non-sterotypical fashion which eschews the words "weakness,"

"docility," and "submissive." A Chicana is seen by Mirandé and Enríquez, instead, as an active, "strong and enduring figure," often the "back-bone" of the culture and tradition, willingly and conscientiously performing "essential family and societal functions (116)" even before she, like her Anglo neighbor, is forced to join the national work force. Children expecially girls, tend to be assigned specific behavioral roles but both boys and girls are required to behave in a respectful and deferential manner in front of adults, particularly the older ones (112). The ideas above mirror the pattern which tends to distinguish Mexican-American familism from its Anglo counterpart: very specific family roles tend to be accorded to men, women, and children.

The pattern of specified roles observed within a Mexican-American family may also carry over into the larger community. A recent study identifies these various behavioral modes from the point of view of the mexicano himself. Deane (1981) gathers a variety of notions concerning Hispanic patterns of communication into the concept of el respeto. Identified as "one of the most important features of contemporary Mexican-American culture," she agrees with Díaz-Guerrero who generally sees it expressed as "one's duty to obey, expected protection, and non-interference in another's life." Its observance symbolizes the recognition of a "person's inherent value as a human being as well as his/her social role." She also agrees with Murillo that a respectful "Latino manner requires an indirect approach in dealing with others" and the use of diplomacy and tactful communication...to provide a screen for the preservation of another's dignity (1)." On the basis of these general observations she probes both the Aztec and Spanish origins of el respeto finding it manifested by 1) deference, 2) courtesy or politeness, 3) behavior which indicates one's knowledge of one's place in a given social setting (i.e., "saber su lugar"), and 4) the necessity of being "bién educado" or the need to practice Hispanic social protocol in accordance with one's place in society. Deane affirms

that this is evidence of an Indo-Hispanic heritage which combines "Spanish passion for ennoblement and honor," especially through the acquirement of various social honors including nobility titles (i.e., hidalgo, caballero, duque, conde, etc.), and an Aztec penchant for the refined expression of respect and subervience. She correctly views the Chicano as an heir to both these status-conscious societies. Moreover, Schooler (1976) offers valuable complements to her findings.

Schooler theorizes that certain American ethnic groups (i.e., Germans Italians, Poles, Blacks, etc.), whose ancestors most recently experienced serfdom, manifest peculiarities which help to set them apart from Americans whose grandparents and great-grandparents enjoyed relative freedom from bondage in their home countries. The peculiarities are identified as "intellectual inflexibility, authoritariansim, and pragmatic legalistic morality," all of which may be paraphrased as follows.

Americans who are descended from Germans, Italians, Poles, and African slaves, for example, most probably display low levels of schrewdness and adaptability especially in the practice of modern business methods (1284); they most probably reflect a rigid conformity to authoritarianism, including its parental variant (1273); and most probably they practice "moral" standards imposed externally (i.e., family codes, paternalism, caudillismo, community and church mores including compadrazyo, state laws, etc.; 1273) thus possibly contributing to a strong sense of fatalism and a low sense of self-worth. This may stem from a frequent or an occasional inability or unwillingness to conform to certain standards. Lastly, Schooler attributes these constrictions on behavior as "remnants of cultural patterns originating in the [pre-modern feudalistic conditions found in the] agricultural sectors of the old country, brought over by the immigrants and carried on

to some extent by their descendants (1282)." In other words, "though no longer serfs, Americans from ethnic groups with a recent and pervasive history of serfdom appear heirs to cultural traditions whose values were molded by the oppressed lives of their ancestors (1283)."

A reference to Hofstede's (1980) unusual study may be inserted here because it complements the Schooler thesis above somewhat. Based on empirical field data, his book

> explores the differences in thinking and social action that exist between members of 40 different nations. It argues that people carry "mental programs" which are developed in the family in early childhood and reinforced in schools and organizations, and that these mental programs contain a component of national culture. They are most clearly expressed in the different values [i.e., "a broad tendency to prefer certain state of affairs over others"] that predominate among people from different countries (11).

Hofstede reveals four comparable dimensions whose differences hold "profound consequences for the validity of the transfer of theories and working methods from one country to another (12)" and, it may be added, from one culture to another. Although his respondents are apparently mostly of middle-class background, the topics which are generated by the study are: 1) Power Distance (i.e., the extent of non-kinship authoritarianism or the degree to which a boss of any type tries to maintain a power distance between himself and his subordinates and the degree to which the latter seek to reduce it); 2) Uncertainty Avoidance (i.e., the measurement of a(n) (in)tolerance for ambiguity in rule orientation and employment stability and the resulting national anxiety level); 3) Individualism (i.e., the relationship existing between the individual and the collectivity which prevails in a given society all of which reflects in the way people live

together); and 4) Masculinity (i.e., the extent to which a given society tends to endorse goals usually more popular among men particularly of the middle class type.

Hofstede finds that the Mexican data reveal: 1) a high degree of hierarchical authoritarianism as seen in the great distance placed between Mexican bosses and their subordinates; 2) a similarly high degree of avoiddance of uncertainty and ambiguity observable a close follow-through of existing rules; 3) a comparably low score in individualism reflecting a person's relectance to go beyond clearly stated organizational or societal guidelines; and 4) a relatively high national endorsement of masculine goals such as capital gaining and economic development, living to work, etc. The latter may be contrasted with female goals which include, as most important, people orientation, placing much importance in the quality of life, working to live, etc.

The extent to which Schooler's and Hofstede's views may apply to Mexican-Americans is worthy of an investigation requiring, beyond the field of Chicano studies, a review of Spanish and colonial Mexican history and cross-cultural and other interdisciplinary studies. Nonetheless, one observation may be made here regarding the findings of Deane, Schooler, and Hofstede.

Anyone familiar with Mexicans or Mexican-Americans as a group may agree with the scholars cited above that a mexicano possesses a strong sense of tradition and respectfulness observable in his everyday behavior. Another side of him also emerges from time to time, however. This other side reveals a keen sense of defiance which set him apart from others of Indo-Hispanic heritage. This behavioral manifestation, which approximates Ramos' description of the pelado (1962, III), is clearly found in folklore.

Here it is known in various ways including lo arrebatado (that in a man which causes him to snatch whatever he wants or to overturn everything before him in a rage) and el no rajarse (never step back from hard work, sacrifice, risk, or danger). This combination of behavioral qualities is best appreciated in the popular poetry found in a splendid old canción ranchera (a Mexican country ballad) which extolls the virtues of Mexicanness particularly in a male. Among other things it states:

¡Yo soy Mexicano!*
Y orgullo lo tengo....
Nací despreciando
La vida y la muerte
Y si hecho bravata
También la sostengo!....
De na'iden me fío
Y como Cuahtémoc
Cuando estoy sufriendo
Antes que rajarme
¡Me aguanto y me río!

The overall traits expressed in this song are summarized in additional words taken from the lyrics which state, "soy muy atravesa'o'." With these summarizing words the well-known composer states that a mexicano

---

* I am a Mexican!
I am proud of it too
I was born to scorn
Life and death
And if I appear to bluff
Be sure I'll back it up!
I rely on no one
And just like Cuahtemoc
Instead of surrendering
I'll bear the suffering
And laugh it all off!

The excerpts above come from the song "Yo soy Mexicano!" composed by Manuel Esperón. It was made popular in the 1940s and 1950s by the inimitable Jorge Negrete. No attempt is made in putting the translation into poetic form.

is traditionally "contrary' in his attitude. In other words, a Mexican always "goes against the grain." How can these popular self-images be reconciled with the respect for tradition reported by scholars? And, how might they apply to Chicanos?

The answer to the first question is found partly in Ramos and Paz who explain Mexican collective behavior in terms of a conscious or unconscious compensation for externally imposed social marginality and isolation. To go "against the grain," as a pelado might, would thus compensate somewhat for the feelings of alienation.

The work of a handful of Mexicanists also helps us in searching for answers to the questions posed above. Brading (1973), LaFaye (1976), Marshall (1939), Chance (1979), León Portilla (1972), and Schmidt (1978), among others, remind us of the development of criollismo as a unique form of 18th century mexican nationalism which trenchantly rises against privileged Spanish imperialists in the gold-mining and cattle-raising regions of northern Mexico. This regional nationalism flourished so strongly that its costume, music, cuisine, and other colorful facets of its culture eventually became national symbols in the 20th century. It is possible that the leading role taken by northern revolutionary leaders in the 1910s and 1920s contributed to this cultural hegemony as well. Thus, the images known in North and South America of a buoyant and defiant gun-toting charro arrebatado, sometimes accompanied by a handful of paid musicians, best typifies 18th and 19th century variants of this criollismo. Cinema characters like Jorge Negrete and the imagery contained in songs like ¡Yo Soy Mexicano! best convey these helpful visual impressions which appear as latter day variants of Rennaisance noble life styles. In any case, set against a dandy peninsular fortified by royal blood and high political

connections, the northern Mexican criollo, charro or ranchero, had little more than his blustery self-esteem and varying amounts of wealth invested in cattle and pastureland. This social type, in the end, projects his image nationally: it is marked by boisterous-ness and dashing non-conformity. The Indian South, Creole Yucatan, the Mulatto-Mestizo Gulf and Pacific Coasts seem relegated forever to merely regional expressions of Mexican-ness.

The impressionistic images above, taken from folk and popular culture, are real nontheless because they may be seen to "come alive" among certain Mexicans and Mexican-Americans. It should be noted too that the behavior encapsuled in these images is criollo, not Indian. The mestizo contains varying amounts of one and the other. And, these images need to be weighed against the strong traditionalism reported by scholars like Deane, Schooler, and Hofstede. In applying these ideas specifically to Chicanos one more extended observation may be made.

It has already been pointed out that most Chicanos may trace their origins to different regions of the inhospitable North. In this vein, León Portilla sees in the norteño a "substratum common in the attitudes of those who penetrate the North from central Mexico (1972, 81)." This substratum he identifies more precisely as a northern Mexican "ethos" which developed through the 18th and 19th centuries distinguished by a fierce determination to confront danger (particularly against fierce Indians), a remarkable cohesiveness and loyalty based on kinship ties, and an unflagging sense of independence and individualism--all maintained by a criollo-mestizo, cattle-raising culture.

In reviewing León Portillo's thoughts, above, anthropologist Spielberg-Benítez (1981) comes to our aid. He does this by applying a revised version

of Frederick Jackson Turner's (1920) "frontier thesis" on northern Mexicans. He does so by agreeing with Zavala (1979), the distinguised historian of colonial Mexico, that

> the conditions of the northern frontier had stamped the character of the northern people with a certain energy and temper all their own....The Spanish/Mexican northern frontier with its particular cultural and environmental characteristics did exert a significant formative influence on the nature and character of Spanish/Mexican civilization in the region. And furthermore...the social peculiarities of this "norteño" culture are the principle sources or roots of the Chicano's "historical culture" and, perhaps, of the salient fundamental features of his character or personality (11-12).

The quote above postulates the clearest character links available between 18th century "Spanish/Mexicans" and modern Mexican-Americans. Be that as it may, it is still necessary to provide more historical evidence in order to clinch this geographically determined argument. This cannot be done here. However, an additional observation may be made before dispensing with this topic.

The individualistic and rebellious aspects which may be found in Chicano character may also be fed by yet another set of circumstances. An examination of these reveals the immigrant who is willing to risk in the face of an unfriendly or hostile host community. Of the hundred of thousands of Mexican immigrants who crossed the Río Grande in a northerly direction in the 20th century, most, if not all, came as artisans, peasants and industrial workers and nearly all of them, in the long run, turned their backs on Mexican dictatorships, protracted civil war, limited opportunities, and primitive forms of economic exploitation. These conditions directly contributed, for example, to the anarchist revolutionary zeal of Ricardo

Flores Magón who died miserably in a U.S. federal prison because he had fought to change them (Gómez-Quiñones 1973). On a personal level, my own orphaned father, who carried bitter childhood memories of penury and loneliness to his California grave, often reiterated his contradictory feelings: he nourished love for his fatherland but defiantly chose to give it up in order to provide his children with better opportunities to develop mind and body in the United States. His has been the bitter experience of many Mexican immigrants.

I assert that the sense of individualism cited by León Portilla and Spielberg Benítez may have been revitalized by the immigrant experience. In other words, once a Mexican arrived in the United States and established a toiler's livelihood in a society which proclaimed Liberty And Freedom For All yet practiced nativism and racism on most newcomers, especially the immigrant poor, whatever norteño sense of defiance and struggle he possessed awakened once more and remained very much alive. Moreover, in a society which also encouraged the erosion of time-sanctioned traditions, including the abandonment of the language of his ancestors, the mexicano more often than not responded self-defensively either in a rebellious and boisterous fashion or in masked frustration akin to Ramos' pelado. The old stand-off attitude, once taken up by the immigrant's ancestors against gachupines*, avaricious creole land-owners, and melagomanic mestizo "generals" of whatever revolution, could now be unsheathed against "bad" gringos. Not all gringos were of this kind, of course. Thus, contradictory as it may seem, a rebellious streak in the Chicano, especially among the working-class, may exist side by side with his seemingly subservient respect for traditionalism, deference, and courtesy. In a mexicano they sometimes go together.

*A pejorative word used to refer to a Spaniard.

With the exception of the brief references to distinctly racial features, the components of a Chicano's Mexican Inheritance briefly discussed above represent only a fraction of those which may be identified as culturally-learned "mental programs." Additional ones remain for others to define and discuss. In any case, most Mexican-Americans have taught these "mental programs" to their children with a success that varies enormously in accordance with a multiplicity of factors some of which are discussed below. However, the Anglo-American set of "programs," also a part of the Chicano, needs to be considered here as well. Let us turn to their discussion.

The Anglo Within Us

As stated previously, this obvious font of socialization has been consistently overlooked by nearly all Chicano specialists. It may be surmised that we have been eager to disclaim in oursleves that which we have roundly and passionately criticized in our Anglo neighbors. In any case, the Anglo within us is irrefutable. In some of us it makes up our character almost entirely, in others it lies within us in smaller amounts.

The following remarks should be seen as introductory aimed at stimulating a more detailed and thoughtful discussion of this much neglected aspect of Mexican-American-ness. To guide us along our path we may ask rhetorically, what is the Anglo within us? What have Anglos shared willingly or unwillingly with us? Uncharted as this topic may be, it is nonetheless possible to state generally that much has been shared by our Anglo neighbors and an equal amount has been learned by Mexican-Americans. The process is reversed too.

In seeking answers to the questions posed above, this section seeks

to accomplish two general objectives. 1) appraise what America* may mean to most Mexican Americans, not just the young elite associated with one university or another and, 2) briefly discuss selected forces of acculturation to which Mexican-Americans have been exposed over time. The following remarks begin with the general and proceed to the more specific.

Generally, the United States has represented a land of opportunity to the world, the Mexicans not excepted. The oft-repeated phrase, "America, the land of immigrants," echoes the attraction that it has held and continues to hold for "the tired and the poor" the world over including those of Latin America. Why did they travel from crowded European cities to America instead of Mexico in the 19th century? Because the "tired and poor" believed their situation would materially improve in the United States and not in Mexico. Again, why? The answer lies in America's unique political heritage which was already recognized internationally even in the early 19th century.

An example of the above may be appreciated in one of the earliest commentaries ever printed in Mexico about the United States. It appeared in a series of newspaper articles entitled "Observations on the United States" in the 1820s in Mexico City's El Aguila Mexicana. Aware of the fact that Mexican land ownership was concentrated in the hands of a privileged few, the author of these articles lavished praise on New England's equitable system of land distribution and, generally, on the rapid growth

*The term "America" is employed here in the manner in which most Americans use it: as a synonym for the United States. The term "America" is preferable to the "United States" because it conveys a personal connotation. However, the author recognizes that Americans have chauvinistically used this term as if no other Americans existed, despite Canadian and Latin American claims to the contrary. The fact is that Latin Americans probably adopted the word "American" or americano long before U.S. Americans did.

of its cities and of the nation as a whole. Above all, the newspaper writer favorably commented upon American political institutions which he believed contributed to the nation's political stability and economic prosperity, conditions sorely lacking in Mexico at the time. As an example he cited free and frequent elections which he felt were rare in his own country As documentary evidence he also included Spanish-language versions of the United States Constitution, Thomas Paine's Common Sense, and, as a mirror of his own interests in economic and financial affairs, the act establishing the Second Bank of the United States, Mexico having thus far been unable to sustain a national bank (Sierra 1969, 185-210). Along with many other Mexican intellectuals of the day, the author of these articles perceived the United States as a worthy model for the new Mexican Republic (Brack 1975, 23-25).

Paranthetically, Mexican officials whose job required them at this time to deal with representatives of the United States face to face probably held a very different opinion. The officials are reported to have chafed at the dishonesty, greed, and racism with which American diplomats approached their political and business dealings in Mexico. According to Manning (1916), American ambassadors were quite guilty of this, the earlier ones in particular. Be that as it may, the ordinary Mexican who had no direct experience with official Americans viewed far-off gringo deeds and achievements as attractive and intriguing, instead.

This admiration for the United States, combined with dire economic need on the part of ordinary Mexicans, eventually contributed to their emigration North once a network of railroads had been built to facilitate this. Hundreds of thousands of these hardy souls, willing to risk all of their meagre Mexican investments in one or two oxen, a patch of land, etc.,

crossed the border in the early 1900s. Elsa Recinos, for example, moved from her birth place, Torreón, to the border city of Ciudad Juárez where she begged in the streets in the 1920s in order to keep herself and her baby alive. She and her husband had moved there because there was little for them back home and they were told "that there was plenty of work and money in the United States (Gamio 1971, 10)." Carlos Morales, an orphan from Sonora, also moved to Tucson where in the 1920s he sold his wooden sculptured work. He moved there because he was forced to join a revolutionary band, during the Mexican Civil war which began in 1910, and he "didn't want to go about killing his brothers" anymore. Anyway, he also sought to obtain patents in the United States for the work he preferred to do (Gamio 1971, 13). Pascual Naranjo, also conscripted as a teenager by a government cavalry unit in order to fight supporters of Pancho Villa, likewise escaped across the border near Nogales, Arizona, ca. 1916. He couldn't return to his mother in the state of Jalisco because he had already attempted to take the life of the plantation owner into whose property he and his family were born as indebted peons. For this reason he remained in California most of his life once his mother, sister, and brother joined him there (Naranjo 1975). More recently, Pablo Cruz, who entered the United States near Tijuana in the 1950s did so as a result of a Hollywood movie he saw as a teenager which convinced him he could become "rich" north of the border. In answering why he immigrated into the United States he answered "it was the only way to get money, you see (Pablo Cruz 1975, 37-38).*

* This is a differentiated and flexibly complex characterization of the "pulling" aspects of the American economy. It may be constrasted with the static and simple interpretation offered by Raúl Fernández. In reviewing a recently published volume on the U.S.-Mexican border economy, he chastises its author because he does not discuss "the forceful displacement by U.S. agribusiness...of thousands of peasant cultivators to giveway to capitalist agriculture in various areas of Mexico." Fernández adamantly calls for the examination of the "uprooting" of peasants by "international monopolies." La Red, No. 50 (January 1982), 10.

Additional illustrations of what "America" might have meant to an ordinary Mexican immigrant exist of course. And, Americans (that is, all the rest of us succeeding our immigrant relatives) who have never immigrated from one country to another often fail to realize the full implications of what such a move means. In a word, the "pull" of relatively high wages or political and social stability operates syncronously with the "push" of an immigrant's fears of stagnation in his tradition-bound hometown and/or his personal wants and needs.

For the individuals like the ones named above, the American attraction may have been understood in relatively simple terms. For some it might have meant freedom from political or religious persecution and for the most it probably meant the possibility of obtaining a job, better wages to spend on food, housing, and possibly an education for themselves or their children. As Pablo Cruz put it so simply, "it was the only way to get money, you see."

Scholars explain the "pulling" factors in more complex ways. Among them, Ralph Henry Gabriel (1956) writes thoughtfully and eloquently. He maintains that these expectations were the product of the American Revolution. They were probably, transmitted via letters sent back to the thousands of home towns and villages in Europe and Latin America by the vanguard of immigrants in the United States.

What all this means is that the American Revolution produced what have become eminently practical and durable documents which in the late 1700s helped found a brand new form of government. The government in turn helped fashion the environment found so attractive by the immigrants. The documents referred to above are the same ones the Mexican newspaper reporter praised in his articles on the United States published in the 1820s. Along with the Bill of Rights they contain the ideals contributing to the poli-

tical heritage to which Mexican-Americans also lay claim.

Gabriel reminds us that the aforementioned documents, held up to the world in 1787, contained four basic doctrines: "The first was that human affairs should be thought of in terms of the individual; the second was that progress is normal and that the future promises more than has been realized in the present (1956, 4);" third, that "beneath society, its customs and institutions, a [fundamental] law exists that men did not make," namely the God-given right to life and liberty also known as the pursuit of happiness; and fourth, that the United States was endowed with the mission of "arousing all men to burst the chains [Gabriel here quotes Thomas Jefferson] under which monkish ignorance and superstition had persuaded them to bind themselves, and to assume the blessings and security of self-government (1956, 23)."

The existence of an unwritten law guaranteeing an individual's pursuit of happiness, whether an established government recognized it or not, is to this day quite revolutionary. This humanistic approach to the relations between the governors and the governed is cradled in the Anglo tradition, classically expressed by John Locke. The frightening number of political refugees and economically exploited men and women, who enter the United States legally or illegally in the 1980s, can only verify the enduring international recognition of this unwritten law observed in the United States, at least in ideal terms. In the 1980s Cubans and Salvadorans continue to enter the U.S. because they simply want peace and freedom, so it can be said that this unwritten law remains a beacon today.

The human pursuit of happiness guaranteed by law could not by itself have contributed to the dynamic nation lavishly praised by the Mexican newspaper cited earlier. Something more basic was involved. Americans

enjoyed a singular advantage which Europeans and Latin Americans did not: in the United States an entrenched European-styled aristocracy had not taken root; there was no real fuedal past and this already contributed to a distinct American-ness in the 1820s. Thomas Jefferson's understanding of America's mission perceived in the passage quote above, reveals this. Alexis de Toqueville, visitor to America in 1831-1832, later made famous for his gifted political vision, summarized this advantage which later attracted the world's immigrants. The people whom he met in America differed from his fellow-Europeans, he wrote, because generally they had "no notion of superiority one over the other (1956, 41)." This means that while social and economic divisions certainly existed in America, they differed from the enormous social chasms which separated an aristocrat from a commoner or a land-owning duke from his indebted serf in Europe. Equality simply was not widely held ideal outside the United States. This is why most aristrocratic-minded Mexicans in the 1860s hurled abominations at Benito Juárez because he came from a shoeless peasant Indian background and dared to uphold ideals from the French Revolution and from English intellectual, Jeremy Bentham, which threatened the old colonial order (Berry, 28).

Returning to De Toqueville's views, the small townsman, the artisan, and the former peasant, from one city or another in Europe, could now breathe more easily in America, or so they believed. The exploitation of the common man in Europe seemed less harsh in America. As a matter of fact, the power of European aristocracy had been based on the ownership of limited land and, in America, land was plentiful in the 18th and 19th centuries. This contributed greatly to the American sense of individual freedom which was written into the nation's charters, as Gabriel reminds us. The absence of feudalism in the United states contributed to the legal foundation for

the American pursuit of happiness bolstered in the Bill of Rights, but it also contributed to the sense of egalitarianism.

By applying the concept of egalitarianism to the Chicano people I stress a peculiarity which stands out when a Mexican-American is compared with his cousin born and raised in Mexico. The latter exhibits an acute sense of status- consiousness inherited from a colonial past which stressed whiteness of skin and an aristocratic lineage, already mentioned earlier. Even today, an upper class Mexican will expect a show of deference or clearly expressed respect and some degree of servility from those poorer and darker than he. Despite revolutionary rhetoric to the contrary, the upper class Mexican stands assured to receive these responses. Without a doubt, Mexicans are very status-conscious.

The Mexican-American, by contrast, has shed some or perhaps all of these attitudes. The risks involved by engaging the trails required by the immigrant experience, the task of facing unpredictable situations in a strange culture, and the relative sense of accomplishment that comes by merely surviving plus the adoption of Anglo egalitarianism all contribute to an immigrant's initial shedding of the colonial mentality. His children born and educated in egalitarian-minded America stand the chance of shedding these shackles of a sense of inferiority.*

---

*An observation needs to be made here although it cannot be given the space it deserves. American Indian policies in the 18th and 19th centuries were exclusivist and, in the end, genocidal. As the white man progressed southwardly and westwardly, bolstered by his sense of rugged individualism, he forcibly pushed out of the way or eliminated the native Indian. The pursuit of happiness which the westward settler held as basic to his life did not apply to the red-skinned man (the Indian of Latin America has not fared any better). In any case, the semi-vacant land of North Americas was thus made more livable for the Anglo-American and his immigrant allies who arrived in greater numbers each year.

The wresting of the Southwest by the United States from Mexico in 1848 undoubtedly became one more attraction for the would-be-immigrant to America. The conquest of the west by United States surely meant to many people that the newly acquired lands would now too be opened to economic "progress".*

---

*This is a fact appreciated not only by American capitalists and restless farmers of the east coast, but by Mexican men and women as well. Or , so it appears. The words quoted below illustrate this. They belong to Doña Angustias de la Guerra y Ord, a member of the California aristocracy. More importantly, they also bitterly critize the mismanagement of Californio government. Her comments, however, acquire a greater significance later in the 20th century when the reasons, offered by immigrants explaining their decision to leave home, sound similar to those of Doña Angustias.

> The conquest of California did not bother the Californians, least of all the women. It must be confessed that California was on the road to the most complete ruin. On one hand the Indians were out of hand, committing robberies and other crimes on the ranchos, with little or nothing being done to curb their depardations. On the other hand were the differences between the people of the north and south [of California] and between both against the Mexicans and other bands. But the worst cancer of all was the plundering which was carried on generally. There had been such looting of the resources of the government that the treasury chest was "scuttled." General Castro maintained a corps of officers sufficient for an army of 3,000 men; all good or bad, drew their salaries, more to satisfy their partisans. Of these officers, few offered their services when the hour came to defend the country against the foreigh invasion. The greater part performed no more service than the figure-head of a ship (Weber 1973, 131).

Whether the words above reflect a sentiment held by the majority or the minority of 19th century Southwestern hispanos is difficult to know at this time. We do know that some of them to this day take pride in the practical working relationship that was established with the yankees soon after the 1848 conquest. Historians of the Chicano experience stumble at this fact primarily because it goes counter to contemporary political views. Nonetheless, Fray Angélico Chávez writes that "New Mexico quickly became a willing enclave of the United States, all of her citizens of whatever economic or social level deeming themselves true and loyal American citizens " (Acuña,(1981), p. 48). He casually seems to dismiss the resistance movement, zestfully reported by Acuña, which was led by Pablo Montoya who represented the "resentment [which] smoldered among the masses (1981, 51)."
(Footnote continued on next page)

After the Mexican-American War, mexicanos continued to travel across the Rio Grande in a Northward Movement where they expected the opportunities which, we have said, were made possible by the political heritage as defined by Gabriel. This heritage also served to encourage the dramatic growth of industry and commercial agriculture, especially in the southwest after 1900. Economic changes of this sort were unknown in Mexico despite the Diáz period.

However, expectations are nothing else but that. In other words, the expectation of participating in the fruits of a more bountiful American environment does not mean equal participation in it. Students in Chicano history know this well enough. However, Chicano history chronicles a struggle to obtain that which was almost always expected. It constitutes a narration of struggle to achieve an unenjoyed heritage. This is of utmost importance.

---

*Yet, a few years later, during the Civil War, many hispanos are said to have gallantly fought on the Union side. Still later in the 1898 Spanish-American War which was carried out in Cuba, hispano volunteers zealously fought against Spaniards on San Juan Hill (Otero III, 35)! It appears that Acuña's simple dichotomy which pits the hispano ricos against the poorer hispano "patriots" is far too simple for a lasting historical interpretation. Human experience always defies simple categories so a lot of middle ground probably existed between the ricos who may have fawned on the conquering yankee and the "patriot" who defiantly rose to defend his fatherland.

In any case, the words of Doña Angustias surely mirror Californio attitudes of bitter abandonment against Mexican authorities. Indeed, many hispanos may have strongly defied the United States military occupation of their homeland, an eminently understandable act. But evidence suggests that most, if not all, Californios cared little for the Mexican government on account of its utter neglect for them. An illustration of this seen in Californio ex-Governor Pío Pico. He gallantly fought the gringos but finally laid down his arms and willingly became a "sacrificial goat" for his superiors in Mexico City. He would prefer to forget, he wrote in 1848, that he and his fellow Californios had "been the object of scorn abandoned to misery (Weber 1973, 121)." In the end, the losses of Southwestern land by the hispano land-owning elite, between 1848 and 1900, seem not to have altered the ordinary landless mexicano's attraction for the jobs and security which the United States appeared to offer.

The political heritage legated to all Americans by "the founding fathers," needs to be seen as an unextinguisable beacon held high. Though it has not yet served everyone it must be expected to serve all at least until it no longer serves anyone. Many of our forefathers born and raised on Mexican soil died struggling to achieve this end. It may not appear to be it sight yet for them--those who did not emigrate. However, it does appear in sight for all Mexican-Americans.

We often tend to overlook the fact that few countries elsewhere uphold the dignity of the individual. The illegal immigrant who emerges grubby and disheveled from the chaparral which covers portions of the U.S.-Mexico border already knows this fact well, in his own way, otherwise he would not risk as he does. To argue, as Fernández that he was "forcefully uprooted" by international monopolies" is too simple.

Only a glance at Mexico's constitution, for example, reveals the fact that, in it, the State appears supreme. Even in constitutional theory, the individual is exclusively dependent upon the State. For example, in the section pertaining to "Individual Guarantees," or individual rights, the reader finds abundant illustrations conveying the preponderant role which government expects to play in society: "The Federal State shall designate...," "The State may in its discretion withdraw..," "The State cannot permit...," "The organic laws shall contain whatever provisions may be necessary to prevent..," "The Nation shall at all times have the right to impose...," etc. (Peaseless 1970). As an inheritor of Spanish absolutism, the Mexican State looms supreme. The events in modern Mexican history known as "Tlaltelolco 1968" wrenchingly underline this fact. The beacon of law which guarantees an individual's pursuit of happiness has not been erected there despite the memory of Emiliano Zapata. A centra-

lized authoritarian State stands solidly in its place.

The constitution of the United States, on the other hand, begins with the phrase "We, the people of the United States...." In it, the State does not loom supreme. Instead, it streeses clear lines of governmental organization. The written symbology represented by the two Constitutions reflects reality to a large degree.

Be that as it may, the sweep of American history unveils the wide gap between the American ideal and its sometimes paltry practice. The God-given right to pursue one's happiness in the United States has been guaranteed more easily by the machinery of the State for middle-class Anglo-Americans. The dark-skinned non-Anglo members of the working class have enjoyed this guarantee less frequently. Wiebe (1975), for example, views American society especially in the 19th century as "segemented," only the members of a "true-blue" group, organization, or segment enjoying best the fruits of America.

> Elite-males, defined by the functions they performed in an urban-industrial system, now depended upon their jobs for self respect....Their center of liberty, therefore, was the occupational segment and they defended its autonomy with the same tenacity that had once protected the community (55).

The newcomers joined up only if they could. Most could not because they looked different and spoke a "foreign tongue." Blacks, of course, were entirely shut out as a group. In the beginning the immigrants could only belong to their own ethnic association which were not "true-blue," of course. The various mutual assistance organizations contained in Chicano history illustrate this well.

The ideal contained in the political heritage of America, however,

was not abandoned even though it was reached only by a few. It was always upheld for one group or another each one gaining access to its fruits after much time and sacrifice expended. A painful trial period, lasting the duration of an entire generation or more, appeared as the down payment for incorporation into America by the more "assimilable groups." As already stated, the darker-looking ones, those who were culturally distinct, paid the highest price for the longest time. Even so, the ideal was maintained because, if not the group as a whole, individuals gained the promises of America. This, in fact, has helped to keep the standard of America intact.

Wiebe's view of a "segmented" society is , in the end, not a disunited one. It is pluralistic enjoying a consensus of sorts (5). Kammen, who views Americans as the "people of paradox," also writes that "America was always promises.....The lack of legitimacy and an excess of unstable pluralism," he adds, have contributed to many "bi-formities" or contradictions present in American society which, in the end, seem to function somehow. These may be seen in conservatism and liberalism, individualism and corporatism, hierarchy and equalitarianism, emotionalism and rationalism (92).... 'corporate socialism'(282)....progressive conservatism (285)....puritanical and hedonistic....isolationist and interventionist (290)," Americanism and ethnic pluralism. Holding together this restless, shifting, and seemingly unending creativity is America's political heritage. It appears to function as the common bond for all groups including the Chicanos.

However, the social environment of America has always been narrowly oriented. Its aim has always been to oblige conformity to Anglo-Saxonism. Baltzell (1964) recognized this tendency:

> For in spite of the fact that some forty million immigrants of diverse religious and ehtnic origins came

> to America in the course of the 19th and early 20th centuries, we were a predominantly Anglo-Saxon Protestant people for almost two thirds of our history. Thus, our earliest traditions--in language, political and religious institutions-- were molded in those of 17th and 18th century England (47).

Indeed, this has been the principal orientation, culturally speaking, although Wiebe, Kammen, and Baltzell himself, among others, recognize the uneveness of such a phenomenon. So, in what ways have Mexican-Americans, reared in an Anglo-American environment, become American?

Beyond the upholding the ideal of U.S.-styled democracy and economic opportunity, as discussed above, Chicanos as a group have moved away from the characteristics already referred to in the section, "The Mexican Inheritance." These merit restating here. 1) If one can speak of the Americanization of a Chicano's racial features, it would be tied to the phenomenon of intermarriage with non-Hispanics, seen with greater frequency with Anglos in California particularly. One peculiar variant of this trend indicates that Mexican-Americans having non-Spanish first names are more apt to marry Anglos (Murguía, "Given names and Chicano Intermarriage," La Red No. 40, March 1981). "An English given name is an indicator of cultural assimilation," Murguía explains (La Red No. 54, May, 1982). 2) Linguistically, a clear trend observes the abandonment of Spanish among non-immigrant Mexican-Americans in favor of bilingualism, a mixture of Spanish and English words even within one sentence, or English monolingualism. 3) The appellative system reflects not only a tendency of favoring English given names, as Murguía observes, but also adopting the Anglo name system which inverts the patronymic with the matronymic the latter often being entirely omitted. 4) The system of food preparation appears to reveal a de-emphasis in the

reliance on complex vegetarian-based dishes in favor of heavier consumption of meat and widespread use of factory prepared foods. 5) Despite recent Chicano attempts to recognize the value of herbals and curandero-administered remedies, Mexican-American health maintenance systems probably rely more on modern science than ever before. Etc.

The peculiarities identified above may be casually designated by some as signs of "agabachamiento." This is a pejorative way to describe the assimiliation of the "white man's" ways. These signs are found among many Mexican-Americans, even Chicano "militants." They constitute surface phenomenae of deep-set adjustments made necessary by historic and economic circumstances altogether constituting abstract forces present in a bicultural frontier such as the U.S.-Mexico border. As a result, the shipwrecked mexicano traditions are gradually abandoned in favor of "progress" and "change." These abstract forces include: 1) the national obsession with "progress," and 2) secularism. Let us turn to a brief discussion of these.

It may be stated that modern Americans generally appear to consecrate "progress" and "change" in all areas of their lives. Perhaps the willingness to experiment in new political forms in the 18th century led a similar search for uncharted economic and social "progress" in the 19th and 20th centuries. It appears that the same forces which sought to free men and women from the drudgery of hard toil, by inventing labor-saving devices, also promoted liberated leisure. The disadvantages of the latter necessarily include the break down of old-country traditions and practices not the least of which is both the extended and the nuclear family. (Widely held attitudes toward fast-paced change have begun to take a negative turn, however. For instance, older Americans, who have known another epoch, probably react to this state of perpetual flux with disconcerting

malaise while younger ones, who ultimately engage in a search for stable universals, may often experience despondency.)

This modern penchant for that which is new has defintely brought grief at one time or another to a majority of the Mexican families living in the U.S. This grief and concern probably rises in direct proportion to the adoption of untested social mores and the rejection of the Mexican cultural inheritance.

Among the first cherished aspects of lo mexicano that begins to erode among immigrants is the use of Spanish, already discussed. Already stated too is the fact that, except for designated regions of the Southwest, it practically disappears within a generation or two. The concept of el respecto, as discussed by Deane, is often next in line because deference, shown especially by children toward the adults in a family, weakens as a preferred form of personal behavior. The role of the woman as wife and mother also tends to undergo change. In otherwords, the clearly designated roles assigned to families by Mexican culture tend to suffer confusion and in some cases eventual collapse. Forms of recognizing another human being's presence through cherished ritualized greetings (i.e., "buenos días," "pase usted, está en su casa," etc.) illustrate "old fashioned" costumbres that also quickly go by the wayside in modern America. The much celebrated formation of gangs in big-city Chicano barrios, and the attendant orientation to drugs and violence on the part of yesterday's pachuchos and today's vatos or cholos, also represent extraordinarily tragic distortions of the traditional Mexican family. That many of these social types stem from poverty, marginalization, and alienation in an adopted culture does not make them any less pitiful adaptions to it. Anglo-American "progress" and "change" have thus contributed to distortions

in the Chicano social and cultural fabric.

American society has also striven consciously towards secularism. This indifference to or rejection of religious considerations in everyday life has likewise brought pain and conflict to mexicanos. Secularism in America appears to be founded on the rationalist-humanist values separating church and state, written into basic national documents like the Constitution. Having been accepted early as a political principle, secularism in government gradually permeated normal social intercourse to the point where the notion of God has become, in 20th century America, a controversial topic in the classroom, and community life and family values appear devoid of religiousness to a large extent.

In Mexico, religion was so pervasive and the church so strong that, during the 1800s, pitched battles were fought between "liberals" who demanded a change and "conservatives" who opposed it. This caused "rivers of blood" to flow, as Justo Sierra tells it. It may be said that the ancestors of many Chicanos probably gave up their lives and fortunes in the 19th and 20th centuries to help maintain or do away with government imposed secularism. In the end, the church was separated from the state, institutionally, but Mexican society remains religiously oriented and, in fact, staunchly Catholic.

Orozco (1980) has identified this facet of Mexican traditions, largely abandoned by non-immigrant Chicanos, and he reminds us that in the middle of the 19th century, communities of the Hispanic Southwest still practiced rituals that acted as salves for the soul. In illustrating the California variant of this, he quotes don Antonio Francisco Coronel who recalled that

> before daybreak it was the custom to pray and sing an alabado in chorus; at 12 noon other prayers were recited; at orizon (about 6 p.m.) and in the night before

retiring all joined in a rosary and another alabado (112).

Josiah Gregg, one of the first perceptive yankees to travel through the Southwest in the 1830s, observed that in New Mexico at a certain moment of the day, usually at noon or about 6 p.m., church bells rang mournfully. They announced the time for silent prayer, and, as a result

> all conversation is instantly suspended--all labor ceases, even the laden porter groaning under the weight of an unsupportable burden, stops and stands still....the expiration of about two minutes the charm is suddenly broken by the clatter of the livelier-toned bell; when, presto, all is bustle and confusion again (112).

This charming old-world practice persists in back country Mexico and in a few isolated areas in New Mexico where Christmas, Easter, and other Christian feast days are observed religiously.

Not so, among the urban, non-immigrant generations of Mexican-Americans. In this aspect they strongly reflect the contemporary culture of Anglo America. A drift away from Mexican religious formalism, toward American-styled secularism and agnosticism, is apparent even though most Chicanos specialists have so far held an indifference toward this subject.

Only two investigators have seriously examined this issue, so far. Mosqueda (1979), for example, learned that a sense of obligation to attend Sunday Mass and take Holy Communion "was rarely a dominating facet" in the lives of Chicanos. In fact, he found this practice was observed less among Catholic Chicanos than Anglos of the same faith (164.).

Orozco (1980), however, has broken ground in identifying and discussing the origins of Anglo secularism and in analyzing its impact on mexicanos tradicionales living north of the U.S.-Mexico border. According to him

Puritans and Quakers contribute little to what we might identify as "Americanism." Rather, the origins of Anglo secularism are found among Northern European Free - masons and other "Free Thinkers," including Deists, who in the late 1700s were strongly influenced by anti-Catholic and anti-Spanish baises. Orozco contends that their depersonalized concept of a divine but un-caring God could be more easily combined with progress, doctrines of laissez-faire, and patriotism in order to produce a "false" Americanism, that is, an amalgam of values which do not reflect the strongly religious values of the first "Americans" who landed on Plymouth Rock. With regard to Chicanos, this "false" Americanism, or secularism (as I prefer to call it), has produced what he refers to as "Brown Anglo Saxon Protestant Aspirants" or "brown" aspirants to pro-gressive-minded Anglo Saxon Protestantism.

Whether one agrees with Orozco's views concerning the origins of American secularism, or not, his underlying theses merits consideration: a "significant" number of Chicanos are "fallen-away Christians of all persuasions" and in this condition they ignore "the religio-philosophical realities of their lost heritage (203)." Hence, they are agringados in this sense as well.

Summarizing this section, the Anglo-ness of a Chicano contains at least three broad facets: 1) In the political arena, the Chicano may lay claim to the heritage of democracy as interpreted by the early founders of the American experiment of 1776, praised world-wide. The most attractive feature of this is the constitutional guarantee of the pursuit of happiness which seems to be appreciated most by the immigrant generation. This guarantee, however, appears more apparent than real because most Chicanos have endured poverty or near-poverty status.

2) In the social arena, the Chicano appears as a reluctant participant in the all-American pursuit of change, or that which is new. Even so, while exhibiting a positive side, this American consecration of "progress" has wrought what many Chicanos consider a distortion of their old-country values, especially those whose destruction has undermined la familia. 3) Likewise, on a social plane, secularism is identified as one additional feature of the metamorphosis which a Mexican undergoes on his way to becoming a Chicano. This a-religious aspect of Mexican-American life may be seen, by some, as a freedom from "the opium of religion." Others however, may see Catholicism as a traditional social cement which has preserved valuable human ideals even in the face of scarcity.

What, then, causes a larger or minor degree of Anglo-ness in many Chicanos? Similarly, how can a larger dose of the Mexican Inheritance enjoyed by some Chicanos be explained? While it may be next to impossible to gain a complete understanding of the phenomenon of acculturation the qualifying factors of time, space, the objective condition, and individuality may provide some assistance.

Time as a Factor

Once the production of industrial and consumer goods quickened in the United States, especially after 1900, social, cultural, and economic changes began to be more easily measured than before. Mexicans living in the United States began to participate in the material culture produced there. Anthropologist, Manuel Gamio recorded this metamorphosis in 1927 when he compiled a list of objects carried into Mexico by immigrants returning from jobs held up North. Besides hens and chickens, presumably transported to fortify rancho or ejido stocks, he noted that the most

preferred items, piled high atop Ford trucks and autos, were American-made beds, mattresses, chairs, stoves, kitchen utensils, sets of tools, and clothing, along with phonographs and records--all of which would soon amaze their provincial Mexican neighbors who had never travelled north (1930, 224-229). These objects represent quantum leaps forward, culturally speaking, and they reflect changing Mexican ways. Thus Mexico in the 1920s and 1930s was never the same again. Mexican-Americans have likewise changed.

If, by some cruel and outwardly racist turn of events, all mexicanos residing in the United States were forced south of the border in 1984 and anthropologists were assigned to record the objects most clung to, in the southward passage, the inventory of Mexican-American material culture would include items which would have struck Gamio as fantastic. These would include television sets, electric ranges, food processors, electric can-openers, clothing fashioned in New York but assembled in the Far East, water-beds, expensive stereophonic systems--all loaded atop amazingly "customized" vehicles. These things also contribute to Mexican-American-ness -- of the late 20th century. Thus, the collective character of the Mexican-Americans, including their material culture, depends much on at least one factor--the place which they occupy in historic time.

The degree of Mexican-ness vs. American-ness present in Mexican-American is also related to one's generation. This is why Casavantes wrote that "first generation Chicanos will have different mores and customs than individuals who are three generations removed from the first arrival in this country (1969, 13)." Similarly, in widely quoted rhetorical pieces, Alvarez (1971, 1973) refers to this critical element by presuming the existence of four generations of consciousness hardened by conquest, "internal colonialism," and racism: a) The Creation Generation

(pre-1900), b) The Migrant Generation (ca. 1900-1942?), c) The Mexican-American Generation (1942?-1967), and d) The Chicano Generation (since 1967?). Generational differences in attitude towards man and universe may not be unique to Mexicans and Mexican-Americans, since they are part and parcel of the experience of all immigrant communities in the United States. But, it is certainly a key factor in understanding the multiplicity of opinions concerning the role of Chicanos in 20th century America.

The universality of this conflict ridden experience is appreciated by a scholar of American immigration who writes, in reference to 19th century German immigrants, that "prolonged controversey and schism were often the result of differences of opinion between newcomers and their Americanized co-religionists (Jones, 1937)." In my view, this generational rift helps explain, for example, why LULAC (League of United Latin American Citizens, founded in Texas in 1929) has been criticized for being "assimilationist and middle-class" by young Chicanos even though the latter were rarely denied a cup of coffee in a home-town diner on account of their Mexican-ness as the former in fact were. One generation sees life differently from the other. This attitudinal rift thus exists between Mexican-American generations and it is noted among brothers and sisters within one nuclear family as well. Let us proceed to geographic space as another qualifying factor of lo chicano.

A Place in Space

The nature of Mexican-American-ness is much effected by geography. Some Chicano specialists have noted this in diverse ways. Among them stands Campa (1979) who has best written about the regional origins of the hispano of the Southwest, especially those of the colonial era; he has also appealed

for scholarly works which examine the cultural formation of each major Chicano region. Referring to the factor of geographic space, in the formation of the modern Mexican-American, Campa observes that:

> There are many differences in the various sections that compose the Hispanic Southwest. They have a different history and were settled at different times for different reasons. The topography, climate, and presence of indigenous tribes differ with each region (vii).

Campa's work helps us to understand the early hispano experience of Southern Colorado, New Mexico, and lower Texas. However, the way in which regional diversity has influenced the millions of Mexicans who took up jobs and residents in the U.S. during the course of the 20th century, particularly after World War II, remains to be studied in depth.

Future work on the regional diversity of the 20th century Chicano must take into account several factors: 1) Mexican geographic origins, 2) the pattern of 19th century inter-racial relations peculiar to each state or region, 3) the character of Anglo immigration to each Southwestern region especially in the 20th century, 4) the extent of industrialization in each region and 5) the attitude of Anglo elites toward mexicanos especially as measured through state government function. These four points are discussed briefly below.

Gamio's pioneering study, already referred to, also offers a view of the regions in Mexico which sent immigrants to the United States in the middle 1920s. The general pattern has not been altered significantly to this day, curiously enough. The sending areas may be broadly defined as the border states (Baja California, Sonora, Chihuahua, Coahila, Nuevo León, and Tamaulipas), the mining region (Durango, Zacatecas, San Luis Potosí, Aguascalientes, Guanajuato, and Jalisco), and a lone but significant

"Indian" state (Michoacán). Relevant here is the peculiar criollo-mestizo character of the people found in the states. It constitutes yet another "grain of sand" which may be added to the understanding of the zestful, adventurous, and resilient character of the northern Mexican or the norteño who bravely populated the border region against difficult odds (Leon Portilla, Brading 1973, LaFaye and Benitez Sterling).

My inclusion of the pattern of 19th century inter-racial relationships between Anglos and Hispanics peculiar to each state or region presumes the existence of differences in those relationships. While this aspect of the history of the Mexican-American has not yet been explored I conjecture that the socio-economic background and geographic origins of the Anglos who entered the Southwest in the late 19th century may be useful in explaining, for example, why the Hispanics of Texas have suffered more degrading discrimination than those of California (Moore 1970, 66; Kibbe 1946), as has been noted already. This may be best brought to light by pointing out that the larger number of Anglos who first populated and settled in Texas after 1836 were formerly residents if not natives of the slave-holding South. Some of them, like Jared Grocer, imported into Texas, Black slaves and the corresponding racist attitudes towards them and toward all other dark-skinned people (Weber 1973, 83). In contrast, the Gold Rush engulfed California with non-Hispanics, to be sure, but they constituted a diverse lot including New Englanders and Europeans most of whom had not experienced slave society directly. The character and background of the Anglo immigrant applies to the 20th century as well. Again, California stands as an exception because it attracted an avalanche of newcomers in the 1920s from all over the United States. These were people whose deep-grained attitudes towards Blacks and other non-whites were presumably diverse, at least, in

in comparison to those attributed to Anglos immigrating into Texas especially after 1836. In other words, Anglos constitute a diverse sort. And, Chicano responses to them differ in ways we need to know more about.

The degree of industrialization occurring differentially throughout the American West, with the highest manifestation of it taking place in California, also deserves mention here as a qualifying factor. One of the seemingly more obvious illustrations which tends to show how the factor of industrialization impacts differentially upon the Mexican-American people is observable in Texas. This state has been, since 1920 or so, a perennial exporter of cheap migrant labor, to the north and west, most of which is Mexican-American. Indeed, much of the Chicano population which settled in Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington during the 1940s and 1950s, includes migrants from the Lone Star State who finally "settled'out" in the these northern states (Slatta 1979, Gamboa 1981, Kibbe 1946). The high incidence of migrant labor coming out of Texas is most probably linked to several factors including a low level of industrialization there prior to the 1970s, "right-to-work" laws hindering unionization, and consequently rock-bottom wages especially for Chicano workers.

California again represents "the great exception" because it industrializes rapidly beginning with World War II. Consequently, farm related jobs decline, especially in the southern California, while factory jobs increase and agriculture migrancy tapers off for most Chicanos residing there (Nash 1973, 195-268). The factor of industrialization, then, may be useful in explaining why Texas Chicanos collectively show a greater number of the characteristics of the migrant worker and California Chicanos the least.

The combined factors presented in the foregoing paragraphs may be useful in summing up the conditions which contribute to "liberal,"

"neutral," or "conservative" attitudes held towards racial minorities, specifically Mexican-Americans, in each state by the corresponding government and business elite. On the basis of the foregoing remarks, it may be conjectured that the Texas elite of the World War II era reflected a body of attitudes, held-over from the 1920s, which was much in line with the values of patriarchal families proud of their ties with the original families who bitterly fought Santanna's armies (I would refer to this as the "Alamo Syndrome"), and proud of their wealth held in ranching and agriculture and now in growing petroleum reserves. The notorious lack of state provisions for the Mexican working-classes of the state in the areas of education, job development, social services, etc., and the deplorable history of racism effecting them probably reflects this provincial elite fairly well.

California, again, is the most obvious contrast to the Texas experience. The politics of the state mirror diversity, vitality, and changing trends commensurate with the variagated population and the equally diverse elite which develops around World War II (Nash 1973, 253-256). California Progressivism is best seen during the administration of Culbert L. Olson whose measures included the appointment of Carey McWilliams as Chief of the Division of Immigration and Housing. As such he became a "tireless inspector of private farm labor camps and a thorn to many farm operators." Legislative leaders tried to unseat him but failed (Burke 1953, 161). This progressive pace produced innovations in many fields including education where "new standards were created: for everybody" including its minority populations. The fact that farm worker unions finally develop on a stable basis in the Golden State and that legislation favorable to them has been written into law there as well, may be best explained in this broader

context, along with César Chávez' dynamic organizing ability.

Thus, a progressive state like California, even with all of its limitations, probably has contributed greatly to the regional diversity of the nation's Chicanos. This fact alone helps us appreciate the bitterness experienced by a Chicano, later turned novelist, who moved into California from his native Texas. Oscar Zeta Acosta met his first California Chicanos in the Los Angeles area whom he derisively called pochos* Recalling this experience he writes:

> California, then, was a land of pochos. These California Mexicans were not much higher than the Okies with whom they lived. They spoke English most of the time [and they acted like gringos]....We [mexicanos from Tejas] were outsiders because of geography and outcasts because we didn't speak English....[and didn't wear] short pants (Madrid-Barela 1976, 53).

The Objective Condition

An additional factor that inexorably controls the degree of Mexicanness and Anglo-ness in a Chicano is his position in American society. In other words, a Chicano's membership in the American middle or working-class, however defined, represents a pivotal element in his exposure and resistance to assimilative forces.

On the one hand, broadly speaking, a middle-class Chicano home tends to adopt English as the home language and to expose its members, more

*This is a pejorative term applied by Mexicanos to their kin born and raised in the United States. Galarza describes the pochos of his youth: "[They] considered themselves too good for the barrio but were not, for some reason, good enough for the American..the pochos acted superior [to the Mexican immigrant], amused at our confusion but not especially interested in explaining [things] to us," (as quoted in Madrid-Barela, 53).

often than not, to Anglo images and ideals. The white collar worker in that home, be it the father, mother, or grown son/daughter, has a tendency to undergo a similar exposure at the job too. The working-class Chicano family, in the other hand, is less likely to be exposed to the assimilative forces contained in the English language and in Anglos or Anglicized Mexican-Americans who act as peers or role models. The migrant worker family from southern Texas will thus be less exposed to assimilative factors than say, an IBM Chicano office manager in San Diego. The more integrated the Chicano feels in American society, by virtue of his middle class participation, the more likely he will be Anglicized.

The objective condition is not as simple as suggested above nor does it operate in a vacuum, of course. Multiple elements impinge upon it including Time and Space already discussed. In reference to Time, for example, it may be stated that the class differences inferred above were more clearly visible prior to World War II due in part to the fact that the Mexican-American middle class was smaller then and the working class was larger and more often of immigrant status. In other words, in the 1930s Mexican-Americans were more apt to be blue-collar immigrants than in the 1970s.

The Mexican-American's position in American society is also affected by geography or space. The degree of sustained industrialization in a Chicano's home state as already discussed will be linked necessarily to the extent to which a middle-class exists in that state and to the corresponding greater number of chances that a Mexican-American will share in it.*

*Another dimension of Chicano life is seen in the drug abuse or the tecato. He exists with greater frequency in the barrios straddling industrialized urban centers which also produce the middle-class Chicano. A student of tecatos, Casavantes, once asked an ex-tecato, who had been "clean" for

(footnote continued on next page)

Available evidence tends to indicate a general rule-of-thumb: the greater amount and longer existence of industrialization, the greater the possibility a Mexican-American will enter the middle-class and hence share degrees of Anglo-ness. And, this varies from region to region, state to state. A Chicano born and raised in McAllen or Brownsville on the lower Rio Grande, where industrialization is relatively weak, will tend to differ in the ways described above from those reared in heavily industrialized cities like Gary, Indiana, or East Los Angeles. Whether he belongs to the immigrant generations instead of the fourth Chicano generation, also adds to the complexity of our subject.

Individuality

The last factor to be discussed is probably the most elusive of all. In the inexorable transformation which a family undergoes, from the time its members cross the border as Mexicans to the time they or their descendants call themselves Mexican-Americans or Chicanos, the factor of individuality clearly impinges upon the others determing how Anglo the family may become or how Mexican it may remain. Several general observations may be made here. First, the factor of individuality appears to act like a billiard ball striking other balls as it careens across the green felt-table. Second, we do not know enough about it as far as Chicanos are concerned. Third, the transformation referred to may happen within one

---

* about four years, what was mexicano in Chicano addicts. Two things, the ex-tecato replied. One was poverty. "The other is that you are always trying to be the copy of somebody. But you find you are not capable, so you go to the easy things, whatever you see in the streets--corruption. And, that's the only thing left for you to copy. So, you get to know the guy who's smoking pot, the guy who is drunk, the guy who is taking some pills, the guy who's fixing. From there you're just trying to catch up. (1976, 141)."

generation or several. And, fourth, some of the family members, in fact, may adjust to Anglo America with difficulty and may choose to refer to themselves as mexicanos instead of Mexican-Americans or Chicanos.

The following observation, gathered from personal experience, illustrates this point: it is not altogether unusual to meet a Chicano "radical," dressed in counter-culture garb with an appropriate protest-button pinned to the lapel, who also happens to have siblings who do not behave in that way. These may include a brother dressed in a business suit who considers himself an "American of Mexican descent" or a sister who has adopted the outlook and to some extent the fashion of her immigrant mother born and raised in a small Mexican community. In this hypothetical example three Chicano "types" appear to exist within one family: the immigrant, the assimilated Mexican-American, and the Chicano militant or "radical." In any case, if they grew up side by side within the same home and experienced similar social and economic conditions, what would explain their differences? The factor of individuality would probably explain this.

The subject of individuality, as employed here, is a topic which exists within a body of literature known as the psychology of adjustment or simply behavioral adjustment. It examines "man's ability to cope with the new environment he is creating" (Kaplan, 3) or, from our point of view, the environment which a Mexican immigrant and his children find in America. This literature contains criteria which have been identified as necessary for a people to make a "positive adjustment," including the fashioning of a set of values to enable the focusing of behavior, establishing satisfying contacts with other people, etc.

More importantly, experts in this field also consider the impact of

cultural differences on behavior, generally, and the influence of "sub cultures" on the process of adjustment. The family, including the individual's within it, is viewed as a frame of reference to study the interaction of family and culture (Kaplan, 98). It is within this area that several psychosocial conditions are identified which may help us answer why people differ in ther adjustment to a new or an altered culture even they belong to the same nuclear family.

Following Kaplan's lead, a mexicano's adjustment to the American way of life may be influenced by many conditions at the individual level. These may include whether he: a) enjoyed the support of a nuclear or an extended family during his growing years; b) suffered a major disruption in his family support system through death, divorce, or separation; c) endured the absence of his mother or father; d) related well with either parent or not; e) what his place was within the family, first born, last, or in-between, and so on.

If so, then the son of a Mexican immigrant, if he enjoys this set of advantages, may do well in school. Once beyond this first step he may then enter the ranks of the American middle-class, on his own grounds. These advantages include being in a position to receive strong and generous support from his family, extended and nuclear, especially from both his parents. If the parents are compatible with each other and live together the son of immigrants may suffer no major disruption during his critical formative years. Beyond relating well to both parents, his adjustment to society, whether new or rapidly changing, depends much on whether he is first- or last-born or in-between; he will probably do best if he is an in-between or a last-born sibling. "The first-born has a tendency towards extremes," due to the primacy he enjoys within the family, Kaplin affirms.

The person born first may actually develop strong leadership qualities or he may simply fall into many "struggles for supremacy" that do no more than lead him into personal and social conflict. The in-between and the youngest children always responding to older siblings, may actually accomplish something tangible with their lives because of this fact (88).

Kaplan's hypotheses need not be totally accepted. They are presented here only because they shed some light on the complexity and diversity of the Chicano people and their collective character. They serve to underscore the factor of individuality in the larger process discussed here.

In conclusion, Chicanos generally represent a racial minority that was forced into the condition of an American underclass of commercial agricultural toilers in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The forces responsible for this distortion were both economic and racial and each had their toll. Chicanos of the middle- and late- 20th centuries however exhibit a greater socio-economic diversity than did their ancestors because many have entered the lower end of the middle-class and in doing so they have undergone varying stages of acculturation into Anglo-America. This process appears inevitable. The manner in which this has occurred differs widely. To be sure, 20th century Mexican-Americans are no longer Mexicans but neither are they Anglo-American. As such they are somewhere in between. The strength of their Mexican traditions and cultural values and the forces of dilution to which these are exposed depend at least on all the combined factors discussed here.

Bibliography

Acuña, Rodolfo. Occupied America; A History of Chicanos. 2nd edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

Alvarez, Rodolfo. "The Unique Psycho-Historical Experience of the Mexican American People," Social Science Quarterly 52 (June 1971): 15-29.

Alvarez, Rodolfo. "The Psycho-Historical and Socio-economic Development of the Chicano Community in the United States," Social Science Quarterly 53:4 (March 1973): 920-942.

Baltzell, E. Digby. The Protestant Establishment; Aristocracy and Caste in America. New York: Vintage, 1964.

Berry, Charles R. The Reform in Oaxaca, 1856-76, A Microhistory of the Liberal Revolution. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1981.

Blanco, Antonio S. La lengua española en la historia de California. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, 1971.

Brack, Gene M. Mexico Views Manifest Destiny, 1821-1846; An Essay on the Origins of the Mexican War. Albuquerque: University New Mexico Press, 1975.

Brading, David A. Los orígenes del nacionalismo mexicano. Sep Setenta Numero 82. Tr. México: Secretaría de Educación Pública, 1973.

Bureau of the Census. 1970 Census. Characteristics of the Population. U.S. SUmmary. Section II. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1973.

Burke, Robert E. Olson's New Deal for California. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1953.

Burma, John H. "Another American Dilemma: Finding the 'Unknown Minority,'" Social Science Quarterly 52:1 (1971): 30-34.

Campa, Arthur L. Hispanic Culture in the Southwest. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, 1979.

Casavantes, Edward J. A New Look at the Attributes of the Mexican-American. Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, 1969.

Casavantes, Edward J. El Tecato: Cultural and Sociological Factors Afficting Drug-use Among Chicanos. Sacramento: California State University, 1974.

Chance, John K. "On the Mexican Mestizo," Latin American Research Review XIV:3: 158-168.

Clark, Victor S. "Mexican Labor in the United States," Bulletin of the Bureau of Labor, Number 78, September 1908 Washington, D.C.: Department of Commerce, 1908.

Deane, Barbara R. (Department of Speech Communication, University of Washington). "El Respeto: An Historical and Contemporary Value in the Interpersonal Communication of Chicanos," paper presented at the Ninth Annual MEeting of the National Chicano Studies Association, Riverside, California, April 4, 1981.

Diáz-Guerrero, Rogelio. Psychology of the Mexican: Culture and Personality. Austin: University of Texas, 1975.

Espinosa, Aurelio Macedonio. The Spanish Language in New Mexico and Southern Colorado. Santa Fe: New Mexico Printing Company, 1911.

Foster, George McClelland. Culture and Conquest; America's Spanish Heritage. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1960.

Freeman, Margaret Beam. Herbs for the Medaeval Household, for Cooking, for Healing and Diverse Uses. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1943.

Gabriel, Ralph H. The Course of American Democratic Thought. 2nd edition New York: Ronald Press, 1956.

Gamboa, Erasmo. "Mexican Migration into Washington State; A History, 1940-1950," Pacific Northwest Quarterly 72:3 (July 1981): 121-131.

Gamio, Manuel. Mexican Immigration to the United States; A Study of Human Migration and Adjustment. Reprint of 1930 edition. New York: Dover Publications, 1971.

Gil, Carlos B. "Remarks on the Meaning and Origin of the Chicano People," Bilingual Resources 2:3:9-13

Gómez-Quiñones, Juan. Sembradores: Ricardo Flores Magón y el Partido Liberal Mexican, An Eulogy and a Critique. Aztlan Monograph No. 5. Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Center, UCLA, 1973.

Gómez-Quiñones, Juan and Luis Arroyo. "On the State of Chicano History: Observations on its Development, Interpretations, and Theory, 1970-1974," Western Historical Quarterly 7:2 (April 1976): 155-185.

Gordon, C. Wayne, et al. Educational Achievement and Aspirations of Mexican-American Youth in a Metropolitan Context. Occasional Report Number 36. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluationat UCLA, 1969.

Hernández, Deluvina. Mexican-American Challenge to a Sacred Cow. Mexican-American Cultural Center Monograph Number 1. Los Angeles: University of California, 1970.

Hoebel, E. Adamson. "Anthropological Perspectives on National Character," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences 370 (1967): 1-7.

Hofstede, Geert. International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Beverley Hills: Sage, 1980.

Kammen, Michael. People of Paradox; An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization. New York: Vintage, 1973.

Kaplan, Louis. Foundation of Human Behavior. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Keefe, Susan E. et al., "The Mexican-American Extended Family as an Emotional Support System," Human Organization 38: 2 (Summer 1979): 144-152.

Kibbe, Pauline R. Latin Americans in Texas. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1946.

Lafaye, Jacques. Quetzalcoatl and Guadalupe. Tr. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1976.

León Portilla, Miguel. "The Norteño Variety of Mexican Culture: An Ethno Historical Approach," in Edward H. Spicer and R.H. Thompson (eds.) Plural Society in the Southwest. New York: Interbook, 1972.

Leonard, Irving. Baroque Times in Old Mexico. Seventeenth-Century Persons, Places, and Practices. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Maciel, David R. and Amado M. Padilla. "The National Character of Mexico: Myth or Reality," in Roger L. Cunniff (ed.) Changing Perspectives on Latin America: Proceedings of the PCCLAS 3 (1974):9-18.

Madrid Barela, Arturo. "In Search of the Authentic Pachuco: An Interpretive Essay," Aztlán 4:1 (Spring 1973): 31-60.

Madrid Barela, Arturo. "Pochos, the Different Mexicans, An Interpretive Essay," Aztlán 7 (Spring 1976): 51-54.

Madsen, William. The Mexican-Americans of South Texas. Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Manning, William R. Early Diplomatic Relations Between the United States and Mexico. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1916.

Marshall, C.W. "Birth of the Mestizo in New Spain," Hispanic American Historical Review XIX (1939): 161-184.

Mirandé, Alfredo and Evangelina Enríquez. La Chicana: The Mexican-American Woman. Chicano: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Möerner, Magnus. Race Mixture in the History of Latin America. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967.

Moore, Joan W. with Harry Pachón. Mexican-Americans. 2nd Edition. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Mosqueda, Lawrence Joseph. "Chicanos, Catholism, and Political Ideology." Ph. D. Dissertation submitted to the University of Washington, 1979.

Murguía, Eward. "Given Names and Chicano Intermarriage," La Red No. 40, March 1981.

Murillo, Nathan. "The Mexican-American Family," in Nathan N. Wagner (ed.), Chicanos, Social and Psychological Perspectives. St. Louis: The C.V. Mosby Company, 1971, pp. 97-108.

Naranjo, Pacual . Interview, San Fernando, California, 1975.

Nash, Gerald D. The American West in the Twentieth Century; A Short History of an Urban Oasis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1973.

National Institute of Education. Children's English and Services Study. NIE, 1978.

Orozco, E.C. Republican Protestantism in Aztlán: The Encounter Between Mexicanism and Anglo-Saxon Secularism in the United States Southwest. Glendale, Calif.: Peterins Press, 1980.

Ortiz de Montellano, Bernard R. "Aztec Cannibalism: An Ecological Necessity?" Science 200: 4342 (May 12, 1978): 611-617.

Otero III, Miguel Antonio. Otero: An Autobiographical Trilogy. New York: Arno Press, 1974.

Pablo Cruz and the American Dream; The Experiences of an Undocumented Immigrant from Mexico. Compiled by Eugene Nelson. n.c.: Peregrine Smith, Inc., 1975.

Padilla, Amado M. See David R. Maciel.

Paz, Octavio. The Labryinth of Solitude. Life and Thought in Mexico. Tr. New York: Grove Press, 1961.

Peñalosa, Fernando. "Toward an Operational Definition of the Mexican-American," Aztlán 1:1 (Spring 1970): 1-12

Plan de Santa Bárbara, El. A Chicano Plan for Higher Education. Analysis and Positions by the Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education. Santa Barbara: La Causa Publications, 1970.

Quirarte, Jacinto. Mexican-American Artists. Austin: University of Texas, 1973.

Ramírez, Manuel. "Identification with Mexican Family Values and Authoritarianism in Mexican-Americans," Journal of Social Psychology 73:1 (1967):3-11

Ramos, Samuel. Profile of Man and Culture in Mexico. Tr. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1972.

Rodríguez Sala de Gómez Gil, María Luisa. El Estereotipo del Mexicano: Estudio Psicosocial. México: Instututo de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM, 1965.

Romano-V, Octavio I. "Don Pedrito Jaramillo: The Emergence of a Mexican-American Folk Saint," Ph.D Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1965.

Rubel, Arthur J. Across the Tracks; Mexican-Americans in a Texas City. Austin: University of Texas, 1966.

Schmidt, Henry C. The Roots of Lo Mexicano: Self-and Society in Mexican Thought, 1900-1934. Texas A & M Press, 1978.

Schooler, Carmi. "Serfdom's Legacy: An Ethnic continuum," American Journal of Sociology LXXXI: 6 (May 1976): 1265-1286.

Schwartz, Audrey I. Comparative Values and Achievement of Mexican-American and Anglo Pupils. Report No. 37. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1969.

Sierra, Justo. The Political Evolution of the Mexican People. Tr. Pan American Paper Backs No. 3. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1969.

Slatta, Richard W. "Chicanos in the Pacific Northwest: An Historical Overview of Oregon's Chicanos," Aztlán 6:3 (1975):327-340.

Spielberg Benítez, Joseph. "The 'Frontier' as a Formative Influence in Chicano Culture," a paper presented at the Ninth Annual Meeting of the National Association of Chicano Studies, Riverside, California, April 1981.

Turner, Frederick Jackson. The Frontier in American History. New York: H. Holt & Company, 1920.

Uranga, Emilio. Analises del ser mexicano. México: Porrua y Obregón, 1952.

Weber, David J. (ed.). Foreigners in their Native Land. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973.

Wiebe, Robert Huddleston. The Segmented Society; An Introduction to the Meaning of America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Willems, Emilio. Latin American Culture: An Anthropological Synthesis. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Ybarra-Frausto, Tõmas. "An Introduction to the History of Mexican-American Art," in The Mexican Museum, Catalog of Selections from its Collection with Introductions to Mexican and Mexican American Art. San Francisco: The Mexican Museum, 1981, pp. 29-37.

Young's Fact-Finding Committee, Report of Governor C.C. Mexicans in California. In Manuel Servín (ed.) An Awakened Minority: The Mexican-Americans. 2nd Edition. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1974, pp. 64-79.

Zea, Leopoldo et al. Características de la cultura nacional. México: UNAM, 1969.

Zavala, Silvio. "Frontiers of Hispanic America," in David J. Weber (ed.) New Spain's Far Northern Frontier; Essays on Spain in the American West, 1540-1821. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, pp. 179-200.